

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 3, 13, 17, and 18 are amended. Claims 3-9, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 20-24 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments comply with requirements of form and thus may be admitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b). Alternatively, if these amendments are deemed to touch the merits, admission is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(c). In this connection, these amendments were not earlier presented because they are in response to the matters pointed out for the first time in the Final Office Action.

Lastly, admission is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b) as presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

Claim 18 stands objected to because the phrase "the display screen" is duplicated in lines 2 and 3. In response, the Applicant deleted the duplication.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 17, 18, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office states that claims 17, 18, and 24 are indefinite because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "the supporting mechanism" and "the first display device" in lines 7 and 8. In response, the Applicant deleted these limitations from these claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 3, 9, 13, 17, 18, and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,410) in view of Gouko (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,507). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims. Claim 3, as amended, is as follows:

A multi-monitor, comprising:

a first display device having a display screen;

a second display device having a display screen smaller than the first display device; and

a supporting mechanism which is detachably mountable on an outside surface of the first display device, and supports the second display device rotatably about a first axis and a second axis intersecting the first axis, the supporting mechanism being supported by the first display device;

wherein the first axis is parallel with a horizontal direction of the display screen of the first display device, and the second axis is parallel with a vertical direction of the display screen of the first display device, and

wherein the supporting mechanism includes:

a first support member which supports the second display device rotatably about the first and second axes; and

a second support member which is mounted on at least one of a side outside surface and a top outside surface of the first display device, and supports the first support member slidably in parallel with either one of the vertical and horizontal directions of the display screen of the first display device, wherein the second support member

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

comprises a round tubular bracket, which is detachably mountable on one a side outside surface and a top outside surface of the first display device using two fixing blocks, each fixing block having a locking member,

wherein the first support member includes a single arm, and the arm is directly connected to both the second display device and the second support member.

Applicant respectfully submits that Milner and Gouko cannot render claim 3 obvious, because Milner and Gouko fail to teach or suggest a second support member comprising a round tubular bracket, which is detachably mountable on a side outside surface and a top outside surface of a first display device using two fixing blocks, each fixing block having a locking member.

The Office in its "Response to Arguments" at p. 5, paragraph 9 states,

"As illustrated in figures 3 and 4 of the applicant's disclosure, it is noted that the supporting mechanism comprising a round tubular cylindrical bracket 7, which is detachably mountable on a side outside surface and a top surface using two fixing blocks 8 and 9, each having a locking member 12. The examiner has recognized that such a structural arrangement, which is incorporated in each of the independent claims, would overcome the rejection using the prior art cited."

In response to the Office's statements, the Applicant clarified that the aforementioned structural arrangement is a limitation of claim 3. In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Milner and Gouko could not have made claim 3 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation.

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 3, and as such include all the limitations of claim 3, and therefore, cannot be made obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 13 requires a second support member comprising a round tubular bracket, which is detachably mountable on a side outside surface and a top outside surface of a mother monitor using two fixing blocks, each fixing block having a locking member. Claim 17 requires a second support member comprising a round tubular bracket, which is detachably mountable on a side outside surface and a top outside surface of a mother display device using two fixing blocks, each fixing block having a locking member. Therefore, both of these claims are patentable over Milner and Gouko for the same reasons discussed above. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 18, 20-24 depend from independent claims 3 and 17, respectively, and therefore, contain all the limitations of independent claims 3 and 17. As such, claims 9 and 18, 20-24 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 3 and 17. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner in view of Gouko as applied to claims 3 and 13 above, and further in view of Crossland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,720,781). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 3 and as such include all the limitations of claim 3. Claim 14 depends from claim 13, and as such includes all the limitations of claim 13. Therefore, these claims cannot be rendered obvious over Milner and Gouko, for at least the same reasons discussed above. Crossland cannot remedy the defect of Milner and Gouko and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office, in its Office action dated November 3, 2003, cites Crossland for teaching "a multi-monitor device having a first display 2 and a second display device 3

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

(Crossland calls an office terminal having a first and a second flat panel display modules 2 and 3. See FIG.1), and the first and the second display devices are driven by an operating system, for example MIRTOS (Crossland says an operating system, e.g. MIRTOS, is used to support module software driven the display modules) (see Col. 4, lines 6-23)." In addition, the Office relies upon Crossland for teaching "an image signal output device 13 (a controller or a central processor 13), which outputs image signals to be displayed on the display screens of the first and the second display devices 12, 16 using display interface 11 and 15 (see FIG. 6; col 3, lines 12-16, lines 58-63)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination could not have made claims 4, 6, and 14 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner and Gouko in view of Crossland as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Register (U.S. Patent No. 5,590,021). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 3 and as such includes all the limitations of claim 3, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Milner, Gouko, and Crossland for the same reasons discussed above. Register cannot remedy the defect of Milner, Gouko, and Crossland and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office, in its Office action dated November 3, 2003, cites Register for teaching "a multi-monitor system (See FIG.1) including a first image signal output device 12 (a computer 12) which outputs an image signal representing an image to be displayed on the display screen 29 of the first display device 16 (the display monitor 16), and a second image signal output device 24 (a display controller 24) which outputs an image signal representing an image to be displayed on the screen

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

28 of the second display device 22 (a liquid crystal display module 22) (See FIGS. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 28-64)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination could not have made claim 5 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner, Gouko and Crossland as applied to claims 1, 4, and 6 above, and further in view of Fowler (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,612). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 3 and as such include all the limitations of claim 3, and therefore, cannot be rendered obvious over Milner, Gouko, and Crossland for the same reasons discussed above. Fowler cannot remedy the defect of Milner, Gouko, and Crossland and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office, in its Office action dated November 3, 2003, cites Fowler for teaching "a multi-monitor including a first display device 110 (the primary LCD 110) hinged mounted to base computer 100 (a base 100) and a second display device 111 (a hidden secondary LCD 111) (See FIGS. 9 and 10; and col. 4, lines 4-6). Fowler further teaches the use of a first wiring 109 (a ribbon wire 109) which connects the image signal output device 105 (a base 105) with a first display device 101 (a primary LCD 101) (See FIG. 8; col. 3, line 2, and lines 63-64), and a second wiring 127 (a connecting wire 127) which connects the image signal output device 100 with the second display device 111 (See FIG. 11; col. 4, lines 17-27)." In addition, the Office relies upon Fowler for teaching "the use of a first wiring 109 (a connecting ribbon wire 109) which connects the image signal output device 105 (the base member or the base computer 105) with the first display device 101 (the primary LCD 101), and a second wiring 116 (a connecting ribbon 116) which

Appl. No. 09/468,581
Amdt. Dated March 30, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of December 1, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 200133-20007
Customer No. 26021

connects the first display device 101 with the second display device 120 (the side or secondary LCD 120)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination could not have made claims 7 and 8 obvious, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6810 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: March 30, 2005

By: 
Barry M. Shuman
Registration No. 50,220

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701